Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences-JCHPS (2026) 19 (2): 14-26
Online ISSN: Online 2349-8552, Print ISSN: 0974-2115
Review Article | Pharmaceutical Sciences | MCI Approved | Peer-Reviewed | Refereed| OA Journal |

Taste-Masking Technologies in Oral Pharmaceuticals: From Classical Approaches to Emerging Strategies

Jyothirmai Bai S, Akhila V, Archana S, Jyothi D, Lalremtluangi, Chandra Shekhar Reddy B*
Sarojini Naidu Vanita Pharmacy Maha Vidyalaya, Hyderabad, Telangana.

Received: 10 Feb 2026 / Accepted: 25 Mar 2026 / Published online: 01 Apr 2026
*Corresponding Author Email: csreddybonepally@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Undesirable taste remains a major barrier to successful oral therapy, particularly in pediatric and geriatric populations, and directly impacts adherence and clinical outcomes. Numerous technologies have been developed to prevent bitter active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) from interacting with taste receptors or to modify taste perception at the receptor or central nervous system levels. This comprehensive review summarizes conventional and advanced taste-masking approaches for oral medicines, including organoleptic modification, polymer coating, lipid- and protein-based systems, inclusion complexes, ion-exchange resins, rheological modification, salt and prodrug strategies, multiparticulate and fast-dissolving systems, and 3D-printed dosage forms. Recent advances in in vitro taste assessment (electronic tongue, cell-based assays) and in vivo models (human panels, animal models) are discussed along with regulatory and biopharmaceutical considerations. Future perspectives include the rational design of prodrugs using computational tools, receptor-targeted bitter blockers, machine-learning-driven formulation optimization, and the integration of 3D printing with personalized palatability.

KEY WORDS: Taste masking; Bitter taste; Oral pharmaceuticals; Paediatric formulations; Polymeric coatings; Ion-exchange resins; 3D printing

1. INTRODUCTION

Oral administration is the preferred route for most medicines due to its convenience, safety, and established manufacturing infrastructure, yet palatability remains a critical determinant of adherence and therapeutic success [1,11]. Unpleasant taste affects patient compliance, particularly in pediatrics, geriatrics, and among patients on chronic therapies, where repeated exposure amplifies taste aversion and treatment refusal [2,3,4,11,12].

Taste masking can be defined as a perceived reduction or elimination of undesirable taste that would otherwise be experienced when a drug product is held in the oral cavity [1,13]. The significance of this challenge is underscored by the fact that over 50% of oral pharmaceuticals require taste masking for acceptable palatability [4,6]. Strategies broadly aim to:

- Create physical barriers between API and taste buds via coatings or encapsulation [1,6].
- Modify drug solubility or speciation in saliva through complexation or salt formation [7,13].
- Alter taste receptor activation or central perception using sweeteners, flavor modulators, or receptor-level blockers [4,5,8].

Because no universal bitterness inhibitor exists, technologies must be tailored to the physicochemical and biopharmaceutical properties of each API, dose, patient population, and intended dosage form [1,6,9]. Recent advances in electronic sensing, computational chemistry, and formulation engineering have expanded the toolkit significantly since earlier comprehensive reviews [1,2].

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences-JCHPS (2026) 19 (2): 14-26
Online ISSN: Online 2349-8552, Print ISSN: 0974-2115
Review Article | Pharmaceutical Sciences | MCI Approved | Peer-Reviewed | Refereed| OA Journal |

2. PHYSIOLOGY OF TASTE AND BITTER PERCEPTION

Taste buds contain specialized taste receptor cells organized in circumvallate, foliate, and fungiform papillae on the tongue and oropharynx; they transduce chemical stimuli into neural signals that the brain interprets as sweet, sour, salty, bitter, and umami [2,14]. Bitter, sweet, and umami modalities are mediated largely by G-protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs), particularly the T2R family (~25 functional members in humans) for bitter taste, coupled to the phospholipase C-inositol 1,4,5-trisphosphate-transient receptor potential cation channel subfamily M member 5 (PLC-IP_3-TRPM5) signaling cascade [2,3,8,14,15].

Bitter taste evolved as an aversive warning signal to prevent ingestion of toxic compounds. Many pharmacologically active agents including alkaloids, macrolide and quinolone antibiotics, NSAIDs, and many lipophilic bases—activate multiple T2R subtypes simultaneously, thereby explaining the intensity and complexity of their perceived bitterness [2,6,14,16]. The human bitter receptor repertoire is functionally diverse: some receptors (e.g., TAS2R38, TAS2R46) exhibit marked genetic polymorphisms that influence individual taste perception, creating population-level variation in bitterness sensitivity [2,14].

Children exhibit higher taste bud density and lower bitter thresholds than adults, contributing to particularly poor acceptance of bitter medicines in pediatrics [3,11,16,17]. This developmental trajectory explains why taste masking is especially critical in the pediatric population and motivates the use of child-appropriate palatability assessments in formulation development [2,17].

3. CLASSICAL ORGANOLEPTIC APPROACHES

3.1 Sweeteners, Flavors, and Cooling Agents

The addition of sweeteners and flavors is the simplest and most widely used approach, especially for syrups, suspensions, orally disintegrating tablets (ODTs), and chewable tablets [1,6,13]. Sucrose, sorbitol, maltitol, and mannitol, along with high-intensity sweeteners such as aspartame, acesulfame K, neotame, sucralose, and neohesperidine dihydrochalcone, provide strong sweetness and sometimes a lingering taste that temporally overlaps bitter perception [1,4,6].

Flavor systems (fruit, mint, cocoa, chocolate, vanilla, cola, cherry) plus cooling agents such as menthol and eucalyptol contribute by:

- **Cognitive masking:** competing taste signals distract from bitterness perception [1,6].
- **Trigeminal cooling:** menthol and other pungent compounds activate non-taste sensory pathways [4,6].
- **Mild local anesthesia:** some agents partially numb oral sensation.

However, for highly water-soluble and intensely bitter APIs (e.g., macrolides such as clarithromycin and azithromycin, and fluoroquinolones such as ciprofloxacin and levofloxacin), sweeteners and flavors alone rarely achieve acceptable masking and must be combined with barrier or complexation technologies [1,4,6,13].

3.2 Amino Acids and Polyphenols as Modulators

Certain amino acids (glycine, alanine, arginine, serine) and food-grade polyphenols (tannic acid, phosphatidic acid-containing lipoproteins, tannins) can reduce bitterness by:

- **Receptor-level interaction:** competitive or allosteric inhibition of T2R signaling [2,14].

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences-JCHPS (2026) 19 (2): 14-26
Online ISSN: Online 2349-8552, Print ISSN: 0974-2115
Review Article | Pharmaceutical Sciences | MCI Approved | Peer-Reviewed | Refereed| OA Journal |

- **Adsorption and precipitation:** reducing free dissolved API concentration accessible to taste receptors [6].

Table 1: Classical organoleptic taste-masking approaches for oral pharmaceuticals

Approach	Key excipients/examples	Mechanism of masking	Advantages	Limitations
Sweeteners (bulk)	Sucrose, sorbitol, mannitol, maltitol	Overshadow bitterness with a sweet taste	Simple, inexpensive, widely accepted	Ineffective for highly bitter APIs
High-intensity sweeteners	Aspartame, acesulfame K, sucralose, NHDC	High potency at low concentration	Low caloric load, useful in pediatrics	Stability and off-taste issues
Flavors and aromas	Fruit, mint, chocolate, vanilla, cola	Cognitive masking, hedonic modulation	Improve palatability and acceptance	Mainly additive; rarely sufficient alone
Cooling agents	Menthol, eucalyptol	Trigeminal cooling, mild anesthesia	Enhances sensory experience	Limited masking for intense bitterness
Amino acids	Glycine, alanine, arginine	Receptor-level modulation	Food-grade, generally safe	Limited clinical data
Polyphenols/lipoproteins	Tannic acid, phosphatidic acid–β-lactoglobulin	Selective T2R inhibition	Potential near-universal blockers	Formulation complexity, regulatory uncertainty

Particularly notable is the lipoprotein system: homogenized suspensions of phosphatidic acid complexed with β-lactoglobulin (from soybean and milk, respectively) selectively and reversibly inhibit bitter responses to quinine, L-leucine, iso-leucine, caffeine, and papaverine HCl without affecting sweet, sour, or salty taste modalities [1,4,6]. This near-universal inhibition of bitterness has attracted sustained research interest, though formulation complexity, regulatory uncertainty, and scalability remain limiting factors [1,4,9].

4. POLYMER- AND LIPID-BASED BARRIER SYSTEMS

4.1 Hydrophilic and Hydrophobic Film Coating

Polymeric film coating remains one of the most versatile, scalable, and industrially established methods for taste masking. Hydrophilic polymers (hydroxypropyl methylcellulose [HPMC], hydroxypropyl cellulose [HPC], hydroxyethyl cellulose [HEC], polyvinylpyrrolidone [PVP], pullulan) can slow API dissolution in saliva by absorbing moisture and forming gels. In contrast, water-insoluble or pH-dependent polymers (ethyl cellulose [EC], methacrylate copolymers such as Eudragit E/L/S, shellac) provide more robust barriers that dissolve only in gastric or intestinal fluids [1,4,6,13,18].

Typical implementations include:

- **Film-coated granules or pellets** for cefuroxime axetil, sparfloxacin, roxithromycin, levofloxacin, ibuprofen, and acetaminophen using ethyl cellulose and Eudragit combinations [1,6,13,18,19].
- **Chewable and ODT cores** built from coated micro-particles, maintaining palatability while allowing rapid disintegration of the tablet matrix within 5–30 seconds [1,4,6,13].

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences-JCHPS (2026) 19 (2): 14-26
Online ISSN: Online 2349-8552, Print ISSN: 0974-2115
Review Article | Pharmaceutical Sciences | MCI Approved | Peer-Reviewed | Refereed| OA Journal |

- **Enteric-coated microgranules** (e.g., lansoprazole fast-disintegrating tablets) that achieve both taste masking and gastric protection [6,18].

Table 2: Polymer- and lipid-based barrier systems used for taste masking

System type	Typical polymers/lipids	Example drugs	Key formulation features	Notes
Hydrophilic film coating	HPMC, HPC, HEC, PVP, pullulan	Paracetamol, Ibuprofen	Swell/gel in saliva	Combined with flavors
pH-dependent polymer	Eudragit E/L/S, shellac	Cefuroxime axetil, macrolides	Minimal release at salivary pH	Suitable for acid-labile APIs
Water-insoluble polymer	Ethyl cellulose, acetate	Quinolones, NSAIDs	Diffusion-controlled release	Balance masking vs release
Lipid/wax matrices	GMS, oils, triglyceride blends	Clarithromycin, enoxacin	Melt-solidified matrices	Provide masking and modified release
Protein-based microcapsules	Zein, gelatin, casein	Alkaloids, antibiotics	Cross-linked protein shells	Food-derived, safe profile
Gel-based beads/jellies	Sodium alginate, pectin, gellan	Paediatric formulations	Ionotropic gelation with Ca^{2+}	Popular in pediatric use

Key design variables include polymer type, coating thickness (typically 5–35 µm), plasticizer level (10–20% w/w), and surface coverage; excessive coating thickness can impair dissolution kinetics and bioavailability, while incomplete coverage can result in residual bitterness and palatability issues [1,6,13]. Recent studies using atomic force microscopy and scanning electron microscopy have revealed that surface heterogeneity and plasticizer distribution influence both taste-masking efficacy and de-masking kinetics in simulated saliva and gastric fluids [4, 13, 19].

4.2 Lipid Matrices and Spray Congealing

Lipids and waxes (glyceryl monostearate, stearyl stearate, hydrogenated oils, triglyceride blends, Geleol, carnauba wax, Witepsol, Fattibase) can form melt-solidified matrices around API particles, often processed by spray congealing, spray chilling, or hot-melt extrusion [1,4,6,13]. These systems:

- Reduce API exposure to saliva by creating hydrophobic diffusion barriers [1,6].
- Provide pleasant mouthfeel, improved palatability, and sometimes sustained-release kinetics.
- They are scalable and can maintain drug stability in moisture-sensitive formulations.

Successful examples include acetaminophen, clarithromycin, enoxacin, indeloxazine, and quetiapine solid-lipid micropellets, many of which demonstrated acceptance by human taste panels while maintaining bioequivalence to reference products [1,4,6,13,20]. Recent advances in lipid-polymer hybrid nanoparticles and self-emulsifying drug delivery systems (SEDDS) have extended lipid-based taste masking to poorly soluble, highly bitter APIs, with improved release control [20,21].

4.3 Protein- and Gel-Based Systems

Prolamins (zein, gliadin), gelatin, and casein-based materials have been widely used to microencapsulate bitter drugs, providing robust taste masking with minimal impact on immediate bioavailability [1,6,13]. These materials achieve masking through:

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences-JCHPS (2026) 19 (2): 14-26
Online ISSN: Online 2349-8552, Print ISSN: 0974-2115
Review Article | Pharmaceutical Sciences | MCI Approved | Peer-Reviewed | Refereed| OA Journal |

- **Protein film formation:** creating physical barriers by cross-linking (glutaraldehyde, formaldehyde, transglutaminase).
- **Hydrophobic interaction:** zein and prolamine coatings shield lipophilic APIs within protein matrices.

Gel-forming polymers such as sodium alginate, pectin, gellan gum, and xanthan gum form weak ionic or pH-dependent gels in the presence of multivalent cations (Ca^{2+}, Zn^{2+}), which can shield APIs like amiprilose, enrofloxacin, and acetaminophen in jelly or bead formulations and are particularly valuable for pediatric acceptance due to improved sensory experience [1,4,6,13,22].

5. COMPLEXATION AND ION-EXCHANGE TECHNOLOGIES

5.1 Cyclodextrin Inclusion Complexes

Cyclodextrins (α-, β-, γ-, and hydroxypropyl-β-cyclodextrin [HPβCD], sulfobutyl ether-β-cyclodextrin [SBEβCD]) host lipophilic moieties of APIs within a hydrophobic cavity, thereby decreasing free-drug activity at taste receptors while often increasing apparent solubility and bioavailability [1,4,6,13]. Taste-masking has been demonstrated for:

- **Small-molecule APIs:** ibuprofen, carbepentane citrate, midazolam, cetirizine, famotidine[1,6,13].
- **Herbal products:** gymnema sylvestre (bitter sweetener for diabetes management) [1,4].
- **Poorly soluble drugs:** enhanced solubilization alongside taste masking[4,13].

Ternary systems involving HPMC or PVP as secondary carriers further enhance complexation efficiency and palatability. The stoichiometry (1:1, 1:2, or 1:3 drug: cyclodextrin molar ratios) and guest-host thermodynamics must be optimized for each API to achieve maximum taste-masking benefit [1,4,6,13].

Table 3: Complexation and ion-exchange strategies for taste masking

Strategy	Matrix material	Representative APIs	Key advantages	Challenges
Cyclodextrin complex	β-CD, HPβCD, SBEβCD	Ibuprofen, cetirizine, midazolam	Reduces free drug; enhances solubility	Cost, complex stoichiometry
Ternary CD–polymer	CD + HPMC/PVP	Poorly soluble bitter APIs	Improved complexation efficiency	More complex formulation
Cation-exchange resins	Polystyrene sulfonates, Indion	Chlorpheniramine, metformin	Strong masking of basic drugs	Need to optimize binding vs release
Anion-exchange resins	Polyquaternary ammonium	Some acidic drugs, such as fluoride	Useful for acidic/biprotic APIs	Fewer marketed examples
Coated resinates	Resin + EC/Eudragit coat	Highly bitter, high-dose drugs	Dual barrier, robust masking	Processing complexity

5.2 Ion-Exchange Resinates

Ion-exchange resins (polystyrene sulfonates, cross-linked polyacrylates such as Carbopol, Amberlite IRP-69, Indion resins) form insoluble or weakly soluble complexes with ionizable APIs that are stable at salivary pH (6.5–7.5) but dissociate in the ionic environment of the gastrointestinal tract (pH 1.2–8, varying ionic strength) [1,4,6,13]. This mechanism is particularly effective for high-dose, water-soluble basic drugs[1,13].

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences-JCHPS (2026) 19 (2): 14-26
Online ISSN: Online 2349-8552, Print ISSN: 0974-2115
Review Article | Pharmaceutical Sciences | MCI Approved | Peer-Reviewed | Refereed| OA Journal |

Cation-exchange resins have been successfully employed to mask:

- **Antihistamines:** chlorpheniramine, diphenhydramine.
- **Antitussives/decongestants:** dextromethorphan, pseudoephedrine.
- **Antibiotics:** ciprofloxacin, ofloxacin, cefuroxime axetil, levofloxacin.
- **Analgesics:** metformin, ibuprofen salts, paracetamol.
- **Cardiovascular agents:** diltiazem, metoprolol, atenolol.

Resinate design requires careful optimization of:

- **Drug-resin binding strength:** balance between retention in the oral cavity (for masking) and rapid release in gastric and intestinal fluids for bioavailability [1,6,13].
- **Swelling and particle size:** influences mouthfeel, tablet compression, and flow properties; optimal particle size typically 50–100 µm. [1,13]
- **Cross-linking density:** affects water uptake, resin expansion, and ionic release kinetics [6,13].

Recent work has combined ion-exchange resins with additional coating polymers or lipids to achieve even more robust taste masking while improving handling and bioequivalence [6,13,19].

6. RHEOLOGICAL, PH, AND SOLID-STATE MODULATION

Increasing vehicle viscosity using gums (xanthan gum 0.1–0.2%, carbomer/Carbopol 934, sodium carboxymethyl cellulose [CMC] 0.5–1%) or polyols (polyethylene glycol [PEG] 400–600, maltitol 10–20%) slows diffusion of dissolved API to taste buds, enabling:

- Higher drug loading in syrups or suspensions with acceptable bitterness.
- Improved mouthfeel and texture acceptance, especially in pediatrics.

pH modifiers (citric acid, sodium bicarbonate, phosphate buffers) create microenvironments that either:

- **Reduce API solubility in saliva:** through precipitation or salt formation, lowering free drug availability to T2Rs.
- **Generate effervescence:** fizzy sensations distract from bitterness and improve sensory appeal.

Solid-dispersion approaches in hydrophilic (HPMC, PVP) or hydrophobic (ethyl cellulose) carriers can:

- Modify dissolution kinetics in saliva and reduce bitterness perception.
- Sometimes improve overall bioavailability through supersaturation in gastric fluids [1,13,23].

Recent advances in spray drying and hot-melt extrusion have enabled amorphous or semi-crystalline solid dispersions with precisely tuned release profiles that simultaneously achieve taste masking and enhanced absorption [4,13,20].

7. PRODRUGS AND CHEMICAL MODIFICATION

Prodrugs represent a mechanistically distinct strategy: chemically modifying the API to eliminate or mask key functional groups responsible for bitter receptor interactions, followed by in vivo or enzymatic conversion to the active parent compound [8,24]. Classic examples include:

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences-JCHPS (2026) 19 (2): 14-26
Online ISSN: Online 2349-8552, Print ISSN: 0974-2115
Review Article | Pharmaceutical Sciences | MCI Approved | Peer-Reviewed | Refereed| OA Journal |

- **Chloramphenicol palmitate:** fatty acyl ester masking the bitter phenolic hydroxyl groups.
- **Clindamycin palmitate and lincomycin:** ester derivatives with markedly improved palatability.
- **Steroid esters:** masking of polar moieties in topical and oral formulations.

Recent computational and medicinal chemistry advances have enabled the design of second-generation prodrugs using:

- **Self-immolative linkers:** Kirby's acetals, maleamic acids, Kemp's acids that undergo predictable intramolecular cleavage without requiring specific metabolic enzymes [8,24,25].
- **Enzyme-triggered release:** spacer linkages that are specifically cleaved by brush border or microbial β-glucuronidase, phosphatase, or esterase [8,24,25].

These approaches can:

- Block phenolic or amine groups essential for T2R binding.
- Achieve complete taste masking even for extremely bitter compounds (e.g., atropine, rivastigmine, amoxicillin).
- Maintain pharmacological activity with minimal loss of bioavailability if conjugation is reversible.

However, prodrug strategies must address:

- **Regulatory complexity:** each prodrug is a new chemical entity requiring full IND and NDA packages.
- **Synthetic and manufacturing costs:** more complex syntheses and purification than simple coating.
- **Stability concerns:** protecting prodrugs from hydrolysis during storage and transit to the target site.

8. NOVEL AND EMERGING APPROACHES

8.1 Taste Receptor Blockers and Bitter Modulators

Beyond lipoprotein and amino acid systems, newer bitter blockers have been explored, including:

- **Adenosine monophosphate (AMP):** selective T2R inhibitor at physiological concentrations [2,8,15].
- **Polyphenols and flavanones:** from plant extracts (Herba Santa, green tea, pomegranate) showing T2R antagonism [2,14].
- **Synthetic T2R ligands:** structure-activity relationship (SAR)-guided design of receptor subtype-selective blockers [14,15].
- **Allosteric T2R modulators:** compounds that reduce signaling amplitude without completely blocking agonist binding [14].

These may be particularly valuable for APIs activating a narrow receptor subset, but:

- Structural diversity of bitter drugs and incomplete mapping of T2R-ligand relationships remain major challenges [2,14,15].
- Regulatory approval of novel taste-masking agents requires demonstrating safety and absence of off-target effects [2,8].
- Clinical translation remains nascent, with most approaches at preclinical or early formulation stage [2,14].

8.2 Machine Learning and QSAR-Guided Formulation Design

Emerging computational approaches leverage:

- **Quantitative structure-activity relationships (QSAR):** predicting bitterness from molecular descriptors (lipophilicity, pKa, hydrogen-bond donors/acceptors, polar surface area) [15,26].
- **Machine learning algorithms:** random forests, support vector machines, and artificial neural networks trained on literature datasets to predict:
    - Bitterness intensity of new compounds.
    - Efficacy of specific masking technologies for a given API.
    - Optimal excipient combinations and coating thickness for maximizing both taste masking and bioavailability.

These data-driven approaches promise to accelerate formulation development and reduce trial-and-error in selecting taste-masking strategies, particularly for novel chemical entities with unknown taste properties.

8.3 3D Printing and Multiparticulates

Additive manufacturing (fused deposition modeling [FDM], selective laser sintering [SLS], stereolithography [SLA], inkjet printing) allows spatial separation of API, taste-masking layers, and disintegrating matrices with sub-100-micron precision [5,8,10,27].

Benefits include:

- **Architectural complexity:** coated multiple-unit systems can integrate taste-masked cores with rapid-release outer layers.
- **Flexible dosing:** 3D-printed structures can be fabricated with precise drug loading, enabling unit-dose customization for individual patients [5,10,27].
- **Personalization:** integration of patient-specific flavors, sweeteners, and sensory modalities (e.g., textured surface to enhance mechanoreceptor input) [5,8,10].

Multiparticulate designs (mini-tablets, pellets, microcapsules) already underpin many pediatric taste-masked products (e.g., sprinkle capsules such as Topiramate Sprinkle); 3D printing provides a path to combine multiparticulates with dose personalization and flavor customization for precision pediatric and geriatric pharmacotherapy [5,8,10,27].

Early proof-of-concept studies have demonstrated successful 3D printing of taste-masked paracetamol and ibuprofen formulations with bioequivalent in vivo performance.

8.4 Advanced Assessment Tools

Electronic Tongues (e-Tongues)

e-Tongue systems using sensor arrays and multivariate analysis quantify bitterness intensity and taste-masking efficiency with good correlation with human panel data in many systems [2,4,9,28].

Advantages include:

- **Objectivity:** eliminates subjective bias inherent in human sensory panels.
- **Speed and cost:** rapid screening of multiple formulations without human volunteers.

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences-JCHPS (2026) 19 (2): 14-26
Online ISSN: Online 2349-8552, Print ISSN: 0974-2115
Review Article | Pharmaceutical Sciences | MCI Approved | Peer-Reviewed | Refereed| OA Journal |

- **Mechanistic insight:** sensor response patterns can differentiate masking mechanisms (coating vs. complexation vs. rheological).

Table 4: *In vitro* and *in vivo* tools for assessing taste and palatability

Method	Principle	Output parameters	Advantages	Limitations
Human sensory panels	Hedonic scoring, VAS scales	Acceptability, intensity, aftertaste	Direct clinical relevance	Ethical limits, variability
Electronic tongue (e-tongue)	Sensor array + chemometrics	Bitterness intensity, similarity indices	Objective, rapid, correlation	Platform variability
T2R-expressing cell assays	GPCR activation readouts	EC_{50}, efficacy for blockers	Receptor-level mechanistic insight	Indirect link to perception
Rodent brief-access tests	Lick rate/aversion in short exposures	Relative palatability, avoidance	Useful for screening	Species T2R differences
Two-bottle preference tests	Choice between test and control	Preference ratio, consumption	Simple, established methodology	Time-consuming, adaptation

Limitations include:

- Imperfect correlation with human perception in some APIs, necessitating validation panels.
- Variability between different e-tongue platforms (Insent TS-5000Z, AlphaMOS, Astree) limits direct comparison across studies.
- Inability to model cognitive and hedonic components of taste perception (sweetness memory, flavor expectation.

Cellular and Molecular Assays

Cell-based systems employing heterologously expressed human T2Rs (transfected CHO, HEK293, or other mammalian cell lines) can provide receptor-level insight into:

- **Structure-bitterness relationships:** computational docking and structure-activity relationships for new APIs [2,14,15].
- **Bitter-blocker screening:** high-throughput assays of natural product extracts and synthetic compounds.
- **Mechanism validation:** confirming whether taste-masking excipients act through T2R inhibition vs. other mechanisms.

Animal Models

Animal preference tests (rats, mice, dogs) and two-bottle or brief-access paradigms remain valuable for:

- **Predictive validity:** rodent taste aversion shows reasonable correlation with human palatability (~60–75% sensitivity) [3,7,29].
- **Mechanistic studies:** examining the role of saliva composition, pH, osmolarity, and flow rate on taste masking *in vivo*.

However, caution is warranted because:

Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences-JCHPS (2026) 19 (2): 14-26
Online ISSN: Online 2349-8552, Print ISSN: 0974-2115
Review Article | Pharmaceutical Sciences | MCI Approved | Peer-Reviewed | Refereed| OA Journal |

- **Species differences:** rodents possess different bitter receptor repertoires (TAS2R genes) than humans; rats lack some human T2Rs entirely [3,7,29].
- **Genetic polymorphism:** inbred rat strains show variable taste sensitivity, complicating extrapolation.
- **Ethical constraints:** animal testing is increasingly restricted, driving a shift toward in vitro and computational methods.

9. BIOPHARMACEUTICAL AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

Taste-masking interventions must preserve or improve the biopharmaceutical performance of the dosage form. Critical considerations include:

9.1 Dissolution and De-Masking Kinetics

- **Minimal release in oral cavity:** FIP/AAPS guidance recommends ≤10% API release in 5 minutes at neutral pH (7.2–7.4) simulating saliva [4,9,13].
- **Rapid de-masking in GI fluids:** >90% API release within 30–60 minutes in simulated gastric and intestinal fluids.
- **IVIVC prediction:** in vitro dissolution data should predict bioavailability and establish bioequivalence to reference products [9, 13, 19].

9.2 Food Effects and Excipient Interactions

- **Lipid-based systems** may show significant food effects due to altered lipid hydrolysis and absorption window [1,6,13].
- **Polymer-coated systems:** generally, show minimal food effects if coating dissolution is pH-dependent (Eudragit L) rather than dependent on gastrointestinal mixing [4,13].
- **Sweetener and flavor interactions:** high-intensity sweeteners (aspartame) may be hydrolyzed at low pH; selection must account for stability in gastric fluids [1,6].

9.3 Regulatory and Safety Guidance

Regulators emphasize [4,5,13]:

- **Justification of excipient choice in pediatrics: particularly for sweeteners (sucrose dental caries risk, aspartame PKU warnings), colors (FD&C dyes, tartrazine sensitivity),** and preservatives (sodium benzoate, potassium sorbate) [4,5].
- **Safety of novel taste modulators:** pre-clinical and clinical data demonstrating absence of systemic effects, off-target T2R activation, or long-term habituation [4,5,8].
- **Appropriate human palatability data:** age-appropriate hedonic scales (faces scale for young children <5 years, 9-point hedonic scale for older children and adults), acceptability endpoints, and treatment-emergent compliance predictors [4,5,13].

Pediatric products frequently undergo formal PQRI (Product Quality Research Institute) palatability assessments with weighted scoring of visual appearance, smell, taste, mouthfeel, and aftertaste [4,5].

10. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR PEDIATRIC AND GERIATRIC POPULATIONS

10.1 Pediatric Formulation Development

- **Developmental trajectory:** younger children (<6 years) show heightened taste sensitivity and are more responsive to sensory overload; older children (6–12 years) show emerging taste preferences and social influences on acceptance [2,11,17].
- **Formulation versatility:** pediatric patients often cannot swallow tablets; formulations must be flexible (sprinkle capsules, ODTs, liquids, chewables) to accommodate individual patient needs and swallowing abilities [1,4,11].
- **Palatability durability:** repeated dosing creates habituation and taste fatigue; taste-masking must remain effective across multiple administrations, particularly for chronic therapies [2,4,11].

10.2 Geriatric Considerations

- **Altered saliva composition:** reduced saliva flow (xerostomia), lower pH, and different enzymatic content in older adults affects taste perception and taste-masking effectiveness [2,6,12].
- **Medication adherence:** taste-masked formulations show significantly higher compliance in geriatric populations compared to unmasked bitter agents [2,12].
- **Drug-excipient interactions:** polypharmacy in geriatrics increases the risk of interactions with taste-masking excipients (e.g., CMC with certain antibiotics or anticoagulants).

11. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The ultimate success in taste-masking lies in integrating multiple mechanisms synergistically—such as combination approaches like coating with sweeteners or lipid matrices with flavors tailored precisely to the API's physicochemical properties, dose, and patient demographics. In the immediate future (1–3 years), the field is moving toward mechanism-guided designs utilizing T2R crystal structures and QSAR modeling, expanded and standardized electronic tongue platforms for early screening, and harmonized regulatory guidelines (ICH/EMA) for pediatric formulations. Over the medium term (3–10 years), advances will shift toward personalized taste-masking via 3D printing, AI/ML-driven formulation models that slash development timelines from years to months, and computationally designed next-generation prodrugs. Looking long-term (beyond 10 years), the vision expands to T2R-targeted biologics such as monoclonal antibodies, genetic testing to pre-emptively identify and treat individuals with bitter receptor polymorphisms, and embedding these taste-masking platforms in digital-health smart pills for real-time monitoring and adjustment.

REFERENCES

1. Sohi, H., Sultana, Y., & Khar, R. K. (2004). Taste masking technologies in oral pharmaceuticals: Recent developments and approaches. *Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy*, *30*(5), 429–448.
2. Mennella, J. A., Spector, C. H., Reed, D. R., & Coldwell, S. E. (2013). The bad taste of medicines: Overview of basic research on bitter taste. *Clinical Therapeutics*, *35*(8), 1225–1246.
3. Mennella, J. A., Beauchamp, G. K., Hausner, H., D'Antonio, A. M., Hegde, A., & Caballero, B. (2014). Worldwide study of the taste of bitter medicines and their modifiers in children and adults. *Pharmaceutical Research*, *31*(12), 3234–3251.
4. Gittings, S., Turnbull, N., Roberts, C. J., & Gershkovich, P. (2014). Dissolution methodology for taste-masked oral dosage forms. *Journal of Controlled Release*, *173*, 32–42.
5. Scoutaris, N., Ross, S. A., & Douroumis, D. (2018). From design to 3D printing: a proof-of-concept study for multiple-unit taste-masked 3D-printed dosage forms. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, *545*(1-2), 380–387.
6. Nanda, A., Kandarapu, R., & Garg, S. (2002). An update on taste-masking technologies for oral pharmaceuticals. *Indian Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, *64*(1), 10–17.

7. Abdulraheem, I., Elsaid, Z., Alhnan, M. A., & Shadi, B. (2016). Is the rat a good model for the assessment of particulate-based taste-masked formulations? *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, *511*(1), 165–174.
8. Stella, V. J., & Nti-Addae, K. W. (2007). Prodrugs for masking the bitter taste of drugs. *The AAPS Journal*, *9*(1), E92–E104.
9. Guhmann, M., Preis, M., Gerber, F., Pein, M., Breitkreutz, J., & Woertz, K. (2012). Development of oral taste-masked diclofenac formulations using a taste-sensing system. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, *438*(1-2), 81–90.
10. Habib, S. R., Kular, J. S., & Sharma, S. (2021). Advances in 3D printing and additive manufacturing for personalized drug delivery. *Pharmaceutics*, *13*(7), Article 960.
11. Breitkreutz, J., & Boos, J. (2007). Pediatric and geriatric drug delivery. *Expert Opinion on Drug Delivery*, *4*(1), 37–45.
12. Nunn, T., & Williams, J. (2005). Formulation of medicines for children. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, *59*(6), 674–676.
13. Charoo, N. A., Ali, A. A., & Al-Taani, B. M. (2018). Taste-masking approaches for medicines. *Current Drug Delivery*, *15*(2), 167–185.
14. Roudaut, G., Marteau, C., & Popovic, S. (2016). New strategies for identifying and characterising the bitter taste of drugs. *Expert Opinion on Drug Metabolism & Toxicology*, *12*(10), 1089–1103.
15. Dagan-Wiener, A., & Niv, M. Y. (2022). Bitter taste receptors for drug development: From structural biology to precision medicine. *Drug Discovery Today*, *27*(7), 1985–1993.
16. Ishizaka, T., Tokuyama, E., Mukai, J., & Uchida, T. (2019). One of the major challenges of oral pediatric drug therapy: Taste acceptability, current status, and future perspectives. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, *565*, 440–455.
17. Ceulemans, J., & Ludwig, M. (2014). Formulations for children. *The Delivery*, *5*(4), 459–469.
18. Pearnchob, N., Siepmann, J., & Bodmeier, R. (2003). Pharmaceutical applications of shellac: Moisture-protective and taste-masking coatings and extended-release matrix tablets. *Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy*, *29*(8), 925–938.
19. Hamashita, T., Honda, Y., & Nakamichi, K. (2007). Granulation of core particles suitable for film coating by an agitated fluidised bed. I. Optimum formulation for core particles and development of a novel friability test method. *Chemical and Pharmaceutical Bulletin*, *55*(8), 1169–1174.
20. Vaassen, J., Bartscher, K., & Breitkreutz, J. (2012). Taste-masked lipid pellets with enhanced release of hydrophobic active ingredient. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, *429*(1-2), 99–103.
21. Qi, S., Deutsch, D., & Craig, D. Q. M. (2008). An investigation into the mechanisms of drug release from taste-masking fatty acid microspheres. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, *97*(9), 3843–3854.
22. Robson, H., Craig, D. Q. M., & Deutsch, D. (1999). An investigation into the release of cefuroxime axetil from taste-masked stearic acid microspheres. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, *190*(2), 183–192.
23. Maniruzzaman, M., Boateng, J. S., Snowden, M. J., & Douroumis, D. (2012). Taste masking of paracetamol by hot-melt extrusion: An in vitro and in vivo evaluation. *European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics*, *80*(2), 433–442.
24. Bundgaard, H. (1975). Design and application of prodrugs. In T. Higuchi & V. J. Stella (Eds.), *Pro-drugs as novel delivery systems* (pp. 1–92). American Chemical Society.
25. Wermuth, C. G., Ganellin, C. R., Lindberg, P., & Mitscher, L. A. (2008). Glossary of terms used in medicinal chemistry (IUPAC recommendations 2008). *Pure and Applied Chemistry*, *80*(2), 277–410.
26. Sun, T., Li, X., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Using machine learning to predict drug taste from molecular properties. *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis*, *205*, Article 114301.
27. Okwuosa, T. C., Pereira, B. C., Arafat, B., Ciezar-Andrade, M., & Alhnan, M. A. (2016). Fabricating a 3D printed thermoplastic structure-herbal material composite with the FDM printer and characterization of sustained release and stability. *Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy*, *42*(3), 444–454.

28. Woertz, K., Tissen, C., Kleinebudde, P., & Breitkreutz, J. (2011). Development of a general model for the prediction of the API's bitterness and the comparison of artificial sweetener masking efficiency using an e-tongue. *Pharmaceutical Research*, *28*(1), 11–21.
29. Avenet, P., & Lindemann, B. (1989). Noninvasive recording of receptor potentials from taste sensory cells. *Nature*, *340*(6230), 154–156.